

**REMARKS**

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Hardy et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,088,488 in view of Grimes, U.S. Patent No. 6,668,058. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The present invention is directed to a method for using a router as a context-sensitive processing array wherein a header of a data packet is encoded with information descriptive of data contained in a payload of the data packet and the data packet is encapsulated into another packet for transportation across a network to an ingress point of the context-sensitive processing array. One step of the claimed method involves selecting the encoded packets based on the encoded information in the header to organize the encoded information into a predetermined hierarchy of information based on the selection criteria.

Significantly, according to the claimed method, the resulting organization of encoded packets corresponds to one or more of the following: taxonomic classification, geographic location information, identity of the source of origin of a goods in commerce, type of goods or services offered in commerce, and brand name for a goods or services offered in commerce. The Examiner's combination of Hardy and Grimes fails to teach or suggest such a method.

More specifically, Hardy is directed to a method for acquiring high-quality images of a structure having a periodic motion, such as the human heart. Consequently, Hardy does not teach or suggest organizing encoded packets according to one or more of the following: taxonomic classification, geographic location information, identity of the source of origin of a goods in commerce, type of goods or services offered in commerce, and brand name for a goods or services offered in commerce. Indeed, Hardy has absolutely nothing to do with commerce whatsoever.

Unlike Hardy, Grimes is directed to methods of established a telephony exchange. As a completely different technology and area of endeavor, the Examiner's combination of Hardy and Grimes appears erroneous.

Moreover, the header of the packets in Grimes contains information for routing a telephone call. *See* Grimes at col. 2, lines 39-40. There is no teaching or suggesting in Grimes of packets being organized according to one or more of the following: taxonomic classification, geographic location information, identity of the source of origin of a goods in commerce, type of goods or services offered in commerce, and brand name for a goods or services offered in commerce.

Thus, even if combined as suggested by the Examiner, the combination of Hardy and Grimes fails to teach or suggest encoded packets being organized according to one or more of the following: taxonomic classification, geographic location information, identity of the source of origin of a goods in commerce, type of goods or services offered in commerce, and brand name for a goods or services offered in commerce. Withdrawal of the outstanding rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

## CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. More specifically, Applicants submit that all of the pending claims are patentable over the references cited by the Examiner at least because none of those references, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests a method for using a router as a context-sensitive processing array wherein a header of a data packet is encoded with information descriptive of data contained in a payload of the data packet and the data packet is encapsulated into another packet for transportation across a network to an ingress point of the context-sensitive processing array, which includes the step of selecting the encoded packets based on the encoded information in the header to organize the encoded information into a predetermined hierarchy of information based on the selection criteria, the resulting organization corresponding to one or more of the following: taxonomic classification, geographic location information, identity of the source of origin of a goods in commerce, type of goods or services offered in commerce, and brand name for a goods or services offered in commerce. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of all pending claims are therefore earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Donald R. McPhail, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with this filing, concurrent and future, to Deposit Account No. 04-1679.

Respectfully submitted,

/drm/  
Donald R. McPhail Reg. No. 35,811

DUANE MORRIS LLP  
505 9th Street, N.W., Suite 1000  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Telephone: (202) 776-7800  
Facsimile: (202) 776-7801

Dated: December 18, 2008